



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,227	02/28/2002	Hiromichi Ito	501.36148CX2	6332
24956 7	90 02/07/2006		EXAMINER	
	Y, STANGER, MALU	CALLAHAN, PAUL E		
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/084,227	ITO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Paul Callahan	2137			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IT after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuding any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	NN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03</u>	October 2005.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	\$53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 5-7 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ection is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bures * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica fority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		,			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	y (PTO-413) Date Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/084,227 Page 2

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2-20 were pending in this application at the time of the previous Office Action. By the latest amendment filed 11-03-2005, claims 2-4 and 8-20 are cancelled. Claims 5-7 remain pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's cancellation of claims 2-4 and 8-20 has overcome all the outstanding rejections of the claims found in the previous Office Action.
- 3. The indicated allowability of claims 5-7 is withdrawn in view of a further review of the related US Patent 6,430,292. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/084,227

Art Unit: 2137

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claim 15 of US Patent No. 6,430,292 contains every element of claims 5 and 6 of the instant application and as such anticipates claims 5 and 6 of the instant application. Therefore claims 5 and 6 of the instant application are rejected on this basis.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. <u>In re Longi</u>, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); <u>In re Berg</u>, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/084,227 Page 4

Art Unit: 2137

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

2-1-06

Paul Culluhon

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
-UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER